LUCIFER.



THE LIGHT-BEARER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 5, NO. 23. VALLEY FALLS, KANSAS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, E. M. 287. WHOLE NO. 217.

LUCIFER---THE LIGHT-BEARER.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

TERMS:

One copy, one year, - - $1.25
One copy, six months, - - 65
SPECIMEN COPIES FREE!

All letters should be addressed to LUCIFER, Valley Falls, Kansas.

No communications inserted unless accompanied by the real name of the author.

Each writer is alone responsible for the opinions, advice or statements made by him.

Bible Temperance.

THE BIBLE AND THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.
AN EXAMINATION
-OF THE-
CLAIM OF MODERN CHRISTIANS
-THAT THE-
BIBLE IS A TEMPERANCE WORK.
By E. C. WALKER.

CONTENTS:

Prefatory Note; Introduction; List A.—Passages Unequivocally Condemning the use of Wine. List B.—Passages Commending or Enjoining the use of Wine or Strong Drink, or both, or including a Plentiful supply of Wine among the Blessings to be Bestowed upon Favored Individuals or Tribes, etc., or including the Deprivation of it among the Punishments Inflicted upon the Disobedient. List C.—Passages Conditionally Condemning the use of Wine, etc., upon Stated Occasions, by Certain Persons upon Certain Occasions, etc. List D.—Passages which Incidentally mention the Use of Wine and Strong Drink without either Condemning or Commending Them. List E.—Passages Showing that Scripture Wine DID Intoxicate. Conclusion.

"Every honest and rational movement in favor of temperance is to be commended, but this nauseating stuff called 'Bible Temperance' is unbearable. I have long felt that this sham ought to be punctured. It has been done at last, and most effectually done by the logical pen of E. C. Walker.
JOHN E. REMSBURG.

Price, per copy..... $0.10
Per dozen..... .90

Address, WALKER & HARMAN
Valley Falls, Kans.

FOWLER'S PAMPHLETS!

CO-OPERATION, its Laws and Principles. 25 pages of splendid reading matter. Just what is needed to-day. *Don't miss it.*

THE REORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS. In the Store and the Bank, on the Farm and in the Factory. Practical application of the principles of Co-operation.

PROHIBITION. An unanswerable argument against sumptuary methods in temperance reform.

CORPORATIONS: With Special Reference to Railways and Telegraphs. The difference between Corporations and Co-operation.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES. Status of the family; sexual ethics of marriage; mission of the co-operative home; influence upon maternity; status of children; children's rights; material richness; cost of consumption; division of labor; social economy; sickness; woman's status the dividing line; practical considerations; associated homes, etc., etc.

Land Tenure. The government's relation to the land; commercial rents, interest rent, futility of arbitrary legislation, potency of natural methods, colonization, country rents, use vs. equal liberty,—equal right usury, vs. administration, size and character of cities, land tenure the index of civilization, list of land grants.

Price, 7 cents each, the six for 35 cents.
Address, WALKER & HARMAN,
Valley Falls, Ks.

J. H. SHULER,
AT BELAND'S OLD
STAND ON BROADWAY,
Has a large Stock of
Furniture!
For Spring and Fall trade. Full supply of Doulins always on hand, and hearse to attend funerals. Terms as low as the lowest.

E. L. SENFT,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.
Valley Falls, Kan.

Dr. Senft uses "Eclectic Specific Medicine." Office over Evans & Kemper's store.

"Westrup's Financial Problem," price 15 cts. For sale here.

THE FAITH FIEND.

Back thro' the dim and silent ages;
Back thro' the tombs of buried time;
Witness the blots on history's pages;
Follow the track of my guilt and crime!
Down thro' the dismal, silent turnings—
Corridors dark of the human mind—
See there the trace of my cruel burnings
And the ghastly relics I've left behind!

See ye the ghostly and pale procession
Gliding along thro' the centuries dim;
My martyred victims; death's expression
Sits on their phantom faces grim.
Hark to their ghostly cries and shrieking,
'Tis the music of old so sweet to me—
My priests on the heretic vengeance wreaking—
And I laugh again in my fiendish glee.

Millions of slaves have I bowed before me;
States and nations have owned my sway;
Their monarchs have bade their serfs adore me;
Yet, what is their glory worth to-day?
For I've cast my poisoning shadow o'er them,
And silently killed with my sickly breath;
And like the empires that shone before them
Their glory is lost in decay and death.

I delight in the smoke and blood of battle;
'Tis sport for me and my priestly knaves;
I goad men to fight like maddened cattle,
'Tis thus they become my blind, dumb slaves
Wide o'er the world have I spread my pinions
Whilst tyrants ever the weak oppress;
And wealth I bring to my pious minions
Who only mock at the poor's distress.

I plunder and kill for the great God's glory;
My hands are red with his children's blood;
And the streams that have flowed from my altars gory
Would bathe the world in a crimson flood.
To my dungeon and rack has Truth been yielded;
I have aided the sword of the coward strong;
With the name of Christ and his cross I've shielded
The holy and sanctified throne of wrong.

I check the rippling flow of laughter;
I chill the sunshine of youthful love;
I wave mankind with the dread hereafter
'Twixt the hell below and the heaven above.
Friendship's golden links I sever;
I shackle the soul with a weary chain;
I crush and smother each brave endeavor;
I load and fetter the human brain.

I enshroud and darken life's brief history,
Around the cradle my gloom is spread;
I circle the grave in an awful mystery,
And fill the living with gruesome dread.
I guide the tongue of pious lying;
I warp the mind with curse of prayer;
I haunt the side of the sick and dying
And mockingly point to my hell's red glare.

I poison the silvern stream of pleasure;
I wither the flowers of the bright To-day;
I bribe men's minds with the phantom treasure
Of the mystic realms of the far away.
I stifle the voice of Inquiring Reason;
I set my signet on Thought's pale brow;
I enslave the soul thro' life's glad season
And a prison make of the golden Now!

H. GORDON SWIFT, in London Free Thinker.

Rome and Reason.

Aggregative liberty is the sum of individual liberties. Dr. Dio Lewis once said that the liberty of the citizen was the broad street leading down to the water's edge, across which prohibition would build a wall, for fear some fool might wade out and drown himself!

There are but two real sources of power to-day: Rome and Reason. One represents God, the other Nature. All efforts to do away with immoral practices by law, emanate from the god side of the question. Every step of real progress has been through rebellion against authority. The pedestal of Liberty has been built from broken shackles, and behind every throne has cowered the priest. Man's emancipation will never come while gods are worshiped.

Let there be free trade in alcohol, and all other poisons, with proper labels to prevent mistakes, and give Mr. Wakeman and all good men and women the liberty to prove scientifically that they are useless, hurtful poisons, and the rumseller's trade will soon disappear.

Liberty is the parent of order as well as of progress, because the fittest can only survive where all are free to struggle.—C. W. STEWART, in *American Idea.*

The Poisoned Paragraph.

Nina Van Zandt still meets her husband by proxy, August Spies, in the Chicago jail. A singular attachment of foolishness to villiany.—*Hartford Post.*

By such homœopathic pellets as this is the public conscience poisoned and perverted to the end that contemplated crime against Spies may arouse no feeling of remorse or pity in the world. The flippant young men who make paragraphs to order, as other men make circles of brass jewelry, sacrifice everything to epigrammatic style, and care more for a sounding sentence than for the life of a brave man or th good reputation of a tender woman. They know not, and oftener care not, what they say if they only say it softly.

There is a wide difference in the devotion of Nina Van Zandt to her lover husband, August Spies. Separated as they are by the bars of a prison and with a death sentence threatening to part them for ever at the foot of the gallows, surely here in real life is a romance that in fiction would elicit the warmest sympathy. But as it is the office of the hangman to hang anybody and ask no questions, so it is the office of him who manufactures paragraphs for the daily press to make Spies a scoundrel in order that the devotion of his young wife may seem perverted. The morality of the hyena compares favorably with this, or would so compare if there were such a thing as morality,—or conscious effort to promote justice regardless of personality or partisanship—in the machine that grinds out daily newspapers.

Spies is not a villain—but if he were, what? Nina's devotion would be only the more pathetic and unselfish. Spies is a young man more zealous than discreet, who fancied that freedom of speech on political subjects is guaranteed by the sovereign powers of this country, and so spoke more freely than was wise in a land where perfect wisdom is not a prerequisite of respectable citizenship. And that, so far as has been shown, is his only offense. Certainly he ought not to be hung for it, nor is the unselfish interest which an affectionate young woman may naturally feel in an intelligent young man, victim of monstrous persecution, any indication of foolishness on her part. But the paragrapher takes no thought of consequences which may result in death to one and worse than death to another of the human brotherhood. It is his business to be smart and say things that jingle in the ear of avarice. We acquit him of malignity only to convict him of the slavish indifference of the mercenary soldier who kills friend or foe with like unconcern and thinks no more about it.—*Winsted* (Conn.) *Press.*

Government and the People.

The earliest form of government everywhere appears as that of the strong man, or best warrior. Among nomadic people, like the Arabs and Tartars, a new tribe begins with a seceder from an old one, like Cain, Ishmael, or Esau, whose desertion proves his spirit, and who has only his skill and courage to depend on. Among the Polynesians, the chiefs are regarded with the utmost awe, as gods, or rather demons, whose spirits live on the souls of common men, but who have the merit of protecting their own people against the still more malignant chiefs of other tribes. Not very different is the idea of a king which we find among the negroes, the early Greeks, or the early Teutons. The Iliad gives us the best possible type of it. The king is the hero, the *aristos*, the human god, whose superiority of body and mind make him the natural ruler of a warlike people. Originally, perhaps an outlaw, he becomes a king by his own merit. He bends the bow which no one else can use, he throws a stone two strong hinds could not lift. He alone knows how to tame a horse, to plow, to make a ship, to build a castle. His wealth, acquired by superior strength and skill, enables him to have a fortified house, a chariot, an armed retinue, while his people have nothing of the sort. Under him they sally out to a neighboring state, destroy the men, and carry off the chattels and women; and when similar calamities threaten them, he only can protect them. He rules with absolute power, gives a friend a few cities as a compliment, disdains to reason with the populace except with blows. *All forms of government are modifications of this primitive tyranny.*

In proof of this proposition, let us run over the known and important ones of earlier date than the Roman Empire, whose institutions are the direct ancestors of our own. The Chinese established themselves in the Flowery Land by driving out the former inhabitants. Their first emperors were despots, and often tyrants. After many revolutions, there followed a division of the country among many petty princes. Confucius, building on strictly historical foundations, brought about the present constitution, under which the emperor is theoretically absolute, but whose administration is in the hands of the mandarins, who are appointed, after examination, by bureaux of their predecessors, *and thus constitute a permanent oligarchy of the learned office-holding class.* In Egypt and in India the king was a despot, and in the former country the name of the first king was held in the utmost detestation. But in both we find the remarkable institution of *varna* or *caste*, which shows that the race to which the king belonged was small, and was afraid of absorption by the conquered people. The priests, as the guardians of morals, and therefore caste, were very much honored and respected, and shared, in various proportions, the power of the king. The Semetic constitutions were variations of the old nomadic type. The "princes of the people" ruled in ordinary times; but certain officers called *sophotes* (the "Judges" of Hebrew scripture, the *suffetes* of the Roman accounts of Carthage) were sometimes elected, and invested with dictatorial powers. Sometimes they made themselves kings. The old Asiatic monarchies, the Assyrian, the Babylonian, and the Persian, rested purely on conquest, and, outside the king's hereditary dominions, discharged no function of government, except, of course, raising taxes. In Greece, the power of the hero-kings went out, though not without many fluctuations, during the sixth century B. C. when each city became rich enough to have walls, as well as the king's castle, and to oppose his retainers with an organized militia. Where all were armed alike, the majority ruled—because it seemed evident that they could beat the minority. Thus originated those forms of government which since the time of Aristotle have usually been recognized among us. It was observation of Greek custom which led this philosopher to the conclusion that there were three chief types of government, the monarchy, the aristocracy and the democracy; that each was liable to degenerate—the monarchy into tyranny, or the merely selfish rule of one; the aristocracy into oligarchy, or the similar abuse of power by a clique; and the democracy into *ochlocracy*, or the rule of the ignorant and vicious, any one of which changes would ruin the state and induce a reaction. During the interval, there might, says Aristotle, be an anarchy, but this could not last. Of course, the reason it never lasted in his time, is that the Greek states were always at war, and that government is usually necessary to conduct a war. Changes similar to those which occurred in Greece during the sixth century B. C. befell about the same time and from similar causes throughout Europe. And the wars of so many small republics ended in their absorption by the Roman Empire. This may be regarded as the beginning of our own constitutional history. Let us pause here to look about us.

I have said that the productive laborers are a subject degraded class, and that governments were instituted to put and keep them in subjection. With regard to the nations of which we have been talking, I conceive the position can hardly be disputed. But the method of oppression, or in common phrase, the status of the laborers, is very different in different countries, and the various methods could hardly be described here without more space than their individual importance requires us to give them. There is, however, a rule by which they may be briefly classified. The science of economy teaches that the factors of production are labor, land, and capital, and the shares of each in the product are designated as wages, rent, and profit. Rent, in this technical sense, carried with more precision "farmer's rent," does not mean a price paid by man to another for the use of land, but that part of the landlord's income which is derived from his title to the land and not from his own acts, whether he lets his land to a tenant, or holds it idle to raise the price, or cultivating it himself gets more for it than his neighbor, no account of its better quality. Thus the man to whom by the customs of the country land belongs, is sure to get his rent; and this rent must be equal to the difference between the productiveness of his land and that of the poorest in use. If he also tills the land, using his own cattle and machinery, he gets the whole product. But if not, then, the laborer's share of the produce, or his wages, are by no means sure to be equal to his share in the task of production. The landlord can force them down to the lowest point at which the laborer will consent to live, work, and produce his kind, and this may give the landlord a margin in what has been called "peasant rent," which does not come under the definition of "farmer's rent," but remains unclassified by ordinary economists, probably because they did not like to call it plunder. Or under certain circumstances, the capitalist, by withholding his capital, can bring down the landlord to farmer's rent and the laborer to bare existence. This, however, cannot last long, for when capitalists form combinations for such purposes, some of them are sure to be tempted into breaking their agreement on account of the quick profit to be realized by this kind of treachery. It is, however, of the very essence of commercial speculation to attempt something of the sort—that is, to anticipate a rise of values, from which it is but a step to creating one. Accordingly the capitalist, far from being sure of his profit, is perpetually engaged in a game of mixed chance and skill by which he may be either enriched or ruined. To adjust those conflicting tendencies, governments, as one or other predominated, have adopted laws of one or other of these types—laws making the laborer's articles of personal property, or establishing chattel slavery; laws attaching laborers to the soil, or establishing serfdom; or laws regulating the process of production and trade according to the assumed interests of the masses, or approaching to what is called State Socialism. Not that any one of these institutions was ever established to the exclusion of others. Under most constitutions we find something of all three. But one or the other usually predominates in a decided manner; and (of course) they correspond in the main to the rule of one class or other,—slavery to that of a citizen aristocracy, serfdom to that of a warlike and rural aristocracy, and approximate State Socialism to that of "the masses," which does not, however, mean the whole people, but rather the class of professional trimmers and politicians. Let us understand this clearly. The economic administration, though regulated by law on which it powerfully reacts, is not to be confounded with the political. It has nothing to do with Aristotle's distinctions of democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. As the factors of production are land, labor and capital, the classes which respectively own these three, when they are not all in the same hands, give rise to these fundamental factions—the landlords, the capitalists, and the laborers. The capitalists prefer slavery to any other system, the landlords serfdom, and the laborers socialism. But it is only a highly privileged class of capitalists, like the merchants of Athens, Rome, or Venice, who can have slavery. Without special and ancient prerogatives they have to consult not, indeed, the interest but the external dignity, of the common people. The great differences between the ancient and the modern republic are that in the former the free poor were few, and belonged to the same privileged class as their neighbors, while the masses of the laborers were slaves; but now there is (ostensibly) no privilege. C. L. JAMES, *Anarchy, a Tract for the Times.*

In Brief, And To The Point.

Dyspepsia is dreadful. Disordered liver is misery. Indigestion is a foe to good nature.

The human digestive apparatus is one of the most complicated and wonderful things in existence. It is easily put out of order.

Greasy food, tough food, sloppy food, bad cookery, mental worry, late hours, irregular habits, and many other things which ought not to be, have made the American people a nation of dyspeptics.

But Green's August Flower has done a wonderful work in reforming this sad business and making the American people so healthy that they can enjoy their meals and be happy.

Remember:—No happiness with at be th. But Green's August Flower brings health and happiness to the dyspeptic. Ask your druggist for a bottle. Seventy-five cents.

LUCIFER

VALLEY FALLS, KAS., Sept. 23, 287.

MOSES HARMAN & E. C. WALKER
EDITORS.

M. HARMAN AND GEO. S. HARMAN
PUBLISHERS.

OUR PLATFORM.

Perfect Freedom of Thought and Action for every individual within the limits of his own personality.

Self-Government the only true Government Liberty and Responsibility the only Basis of Morality.

Relief Fund.

To help defray the expenses of carrying the case of A. Spies, A. R. Parsons, Samuel Fielden and their associates to the United States Supreme Court:

J. W. Cooper, Colorado.....$50.00

ERRATUM:—Mr. Hull's reply to Braden given on fourth page, is wrongly numbered. It should be Eighth instead of Fourth.

We desire to call especial attention to the advertisement of Miss Clay. Let her fellow Liberals who may be in need of the goods she manufactures patronize her generously and thus help a worthy worker in the battle for bread.

We desire our readers to remember that the names of Freethinkers and labor reformers are always gladly received. We wish to send sample copies to all men and women who are not afraid to let their reform faith be known. Write name, postoffice, county and State plainly.

MEETINGS.

Since publishing the announcement of the Valley Falls meeting, in LUCIFER of last week, we have advice from Moses Hull that the date of the meeting is fixed for the 30th inst. to Oct. 4. The following plan of operations, as published in *New Thought* of Saturday last, will doubtless be of interest to many of our readers:

Mattie E. and Moses Hull expect to hold meetings in Valley Falls, Kan., from Sep. 30, to Oct. 4. Thence, probably, they will go to Leavenworth, and attend the Spiritualist picnic there from Oct. 6, to 10. Thence Mr. Hull will probably make a few anti-monopoly speeches in Kansas, and Mrs. Hull will labor wherever the way may open. Keep us busy, friends, you need our work and we sadly need the means to keep the *New Thought* afloat

Now, good friends—friends of Free Discussion on ALL subjects of human interest, shall the meeting at Valley Falls be made a grand success or shall it be a practical failure? The reactionists, the enemies of liberty and equality of rights, are making herculean efforts to unite their forces and consolidate their power. To do this they spare neither time nor money. Will the friends of progress do nothing? Of course, this paragraph is addressed mainly to those who live in eastern Kansas, but we hope to see delegates if not delegations from Central Kansas and from Missouri and Nebraska. It is not necessary that we say anything in regard to the speakers. They are too well, too widely and too favorably known to need any commendation or introduction from us.

The list of subjects proposed for discussion is as follows:

1. The American Sphinx.
2. The New Republic.
3. Labor and Capital.
4. Conflict Between Science and Religion.
5. Battle between Bibles and Brains.
6. Prophecy, its Failures.
7. Some of the Errors of the Bible.
8. Astrological Origin of Christianity.
9. Comparison between the Life and Character of Thomas Paine and that of John Wesley.

The subject of Spiritualism will also receive attention if desired.

The meetings are to be held in the beautiful and commodious Opera House at Valley Falls.

For further particulars address this office.

In this connection we wish also to call attention to the meeting of the "Leavenworth county Association of Spiritualists," an official announcement of which was given in LUCIFER last week. Commencing as it does only two days after the close of the Valley Falls meeting those coming from a distance can attend both with but little loss of time. For particulars, address the Secretary, Mary Hutcheson, Leavenworth, Kan. H.

Special to Ladies. The Emery bag is a beautiful ornament. In rich shades and delicate tints of silk, satin, velvet and merino. Plain 10 to 50 cts. Embroidered or with oil painting 50 cent to $1.50. By mail, Miss. A. C. CLAY, Piermont, Grafton Co., N. H.

TO SAVE HUMAN LIFE.

The subjoined communication from Comrade Cooper is self-explanatory. In our view, as many times before stated, these men are not guilty, directly or indirectly, of the crime charged, and that their "trial" was monstrously unfair needs no argument to prove to any person of average intelligence and unbiased mind. In fact, they were convicted for the opinions they held and taught, not for any crime they were supposed to have committed. This is admitted by the Chicago *Mail*, one of their bitterest enemies. In its issue of Sept. 16th it says.

The condemned anarchists represent the idea of murder, the destruction of all law and order, the dismemberment of society, the downfall of government—treason. It is for that they are condemned to death, not for the incidental killing of a policeman, though that is the legal offense for which they were technically tried and convicted.

And this is the land of freedom and justice!

While life remains we must do all we can to prevent the consummation of this awful crime. Many of the teachings of these men we do not accept as true, but that is an added reason why we should do our best to secure them justice, to save their lives, if possible.

Harman and Walker. Comrades: I see by the "Associated press" dispatches, that the defense association in the "Anarchist case" is making strenuous efforts to carry it to the Supreme Court of the United States. Before receiving this notice I had written Dr. Schmidt pledging fifty dollars toward the fund for this purpose. But would prefer to see you call for subscriptions for the defense of these condemned men, and will then transfer the amount I have pledged to your branch of the fund.

I don't want these men murdered if we can prevent it, and shall not feel that I have done my whole duty in the case until the last peaceable means to save them has been exhausted.

Please take the matter into consideration and act upon it at once.

You can make use of this communication as you may think best.

Your Comrade,
J. W. COOPER.

Cooper, Colo., 9-17-'87.

The Appeal Fund should receive many and prompt contributions from LUCIFER's readers.

H. & W.

RETROSPECTIVE.

One year ago to-day—Sept. 20—two of the workers in the LUCIFER hive were arrested and taken before a local magistrate charged with the crime of—of murder? No! Of train-wrecking? No! Of burglary? No! Of embezzlement, of forgery, of perjury, of criminal libel, of obtaining goods under false pretences? None of these or any other of the fashionable crimes of the day were laid to their charge. What then? The heinous offense with the commission of which they were charged was that they had been guilty of "living together as man and wife without being married!"

To many of our readers the history of this arrest and its consequences is an old story, but to some hundreds of subscribers who within the last twelve months have joined our ranks to help fight the battles of Individual Rights as against the despotism of majority rule, the real facts and merits of this somewhat noted case are very imperfectly known and still less perfectly understood. Judging from the number of letters received asking for information concerning the arrest and imprisonment of Edwin C. Walker and Lillian Harman we think that a short series of articles giving a digest of the leading features of the case as it drew its weary length along through the fall, winter and spring months, would be relished and appreciated by a large number of our readers. We therefore propose, in succeeding issues of LUCIFER, as time and other duties may permit, to give the review spoken of, believing that thereby not only will a laudable fraternal interest be gratified, but a suitable opportunity offered for emphasizing the principles to the promulgation of which our life-work of hand and brain, is devoted. H.

We very much regret to learn that the mother of Susan H. Wixon was recently killed by the horse attached to the carriage she was in becoming frightened at a passing train and, breaking from control, dashing itself and the vehicle against the tender of the locomotive. The sad accident occurred at Wareham, Mass. Miss Wixon has our deep sympathy in her latest sorrow.

"CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION."

The dispatches from Philadelphia show that our Republico-Democratic government is making earnest and able if not entirely successful efforts to emulate the costly and gaudy pageants of European monarchies. On the second day of the Constitution's Centennial Jubilee it is said that nearly "30,000 uniformed soldiers passed in review before the chief magistrate and the high officers of this and other governments, and at their head rode General [Big G.] Phil H. Sheridan." On the reviewing stand there were about a dozen governors of States, and Senator Ingalls of Kansas. After describing at some length the array of distinguished visitors the account proceeds thus:

When the line reached the reviewing stand the president's carriage halted, and, as he alighted to take his place on the reviewing balcony on the grand stand, the cavalrymen stood "right about face" and saluted him. There was a continuous round of cheers as the president rode by, and he bowed his acknowledgements of the compliment as he passed each stand. After saluting the president the city troop proceeded down Broad street to take its place in the procession.

How very like does this sound to the descriptions given us by foreign court journals, of the parades of royalty?

The "memorial address" was delivered by Justice Miller, one of the associate Justices of the United States supreme court. This address occupied one hour and ten minutes in delivery, and was, as might have been expected, from beginning to end little else than a glorification of the work of the convention that formulated the document called the "Constitution of the United States," and a recital of the alleged blessings that flowed from its adoption.

Justice Miller in his closing remarks said:

I but repeat the language of the supreme court of the United States when I say that in this country the law is supreme. No man is so high as to be above the law. No officer of the government may disregard it with impunity. To this inborn and native regard for law as a governing power we are indebted largely for the wonderful success and prosperity of our people, for the security of our rights and when the highest law to which we pay this homage is the Constitution of the United States, the history of the world has presented no such wonder of a prosperous, happy, civil government.

"Homage was originally the act of a feudal tenant by which he declared himself, on his bended knees, to be the *hommage* or bondman to the lord."—Webster.

So, then, when we pay homage to "law" we acknowledge ourselves the bondmen, the slaves of the law. "The law is supreme," says the learned judge." Homage is an act of reverence, of adoration or worship, from an inferior to a superior. As freemen we refuse to bow the knee or to pay homage to any man or set of men and yet we are required to bow the knee and pay homage to a law, a "constitution," that is neither more nor less than the work, the opinions, of men. Why is this? Is the work of man, or of men, more worthy of homage and adoration than the man himself, or the men themselves? Can an imperfect man, or a hundred imperfect men, make a perfect law? And even if it were possible for imperfect men to make a perfect law, would that fact make it the duty of other men to obey and reverence that law?

The laws of nature, the laws of God—if there be a God behind or above nature—are believed to be perfect laws, but do we pay homage to those laws and treat them as supreme? Take the law (or force) of gravitation. This law is believed to be a universal one—always and everywhere operative, and yet we do not pay homage nor acknowledge allegiance to it. We use it, we work with it, when it suits us to do so; and we work against it, we contravene and defy it to the utmost of our ability, whenever its action would defeat our purposes. In other words we try to make friends and servants of the laws and forces of nature, not lords and masters of them.

And so, likewise, we should treat the works, the opinions of our ancestors, the wise and good men who have lived on the earth before our time. When our judgment, our own experience, tells us that their precepts, their laws, their constitutions are wise, and that they are good and suitable to our times and circumstances we should use them, obey them, "pay homage" to them (if you like the word), but if we believe these precepts, these laws to be wrong in principle or unsuited to our times and circumstances we should reject them, ignore them, and if necessary defy them and the men who would enforce the observance of these precepts, these laws of the dead past, upon us.

"Treason!" says one—"Revolution!" says another.

Why, yes; in the sense that the old abolitionists taught treason and revolution, so also do we teach treason and revolution. But it does not follow because we teach revolution we therefore advocate the shedding of blood or the destruction of property. We advocate neither the one nor the other. Passive resistance to tyranny is often more effective than armed resistance. The passive resistance offered by the carpenter, D. B. Boutwell, in Topeka the other day, who was dragged by the heels from the police court to the rock pile and thence to a dark and horribly filthy cell in the city prison—all because he refused to play informer on his fellow-boarders who were accused of no crime—this passive resistance will doubtless do more towards dethroning the cowardly knaves and ruffians who now disgrace human nature by their worse than brutal treatment of honest but poor men and women, than would the shooting of a dozen policemen in self-defense or the blowing up of the city jail by dynamite.

"No man is so high as to be above the law," say Judge Miller. Per contra, we would say, *No law is so high as to be above man*—that is to say, no human enactment is so high as to be above the natural rights of man. We think Blackstone, another eminent jurist, was more nearly right when he said:

"The law of nature is of superior obligation to every other; no human laws are of validity as contrary to this, and such of them as are valid derive all their force from this original."

Again, Blackstone is thus reported, "We are bound to transgress human law when that contradicts divine or natural law."

Of course, by the terms "law of nature," "natural law," Blackstone must mean, *natural right, natural justice!* He can not mean the laws or forces of the physical universe, for the violations of these, as aforesaid, are not considered crimes, though they may take the form of vices.

So then, we would iterate and reiterate the doctrine, the principle that law, human law, is made for man, not man for the law. The law is *not* "supreme," but human rights are supreme. The law is the servant, not the master. The law is the creature, not the creator. The same idea is expressed in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence when it says:

"To secure these rights [life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness] governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Will any one dare to say that our present government secures the right to life liberty and the pursuit of happiness to all the citizens? On the contrary, is it not true that in a thousand ways, the government, the law, the constitution of the United States, are the most deadly enemies to these natural rights?

H.

THE COMING THEOCRACY.

There is a large, powerful and rapidly augmenting element in the Christian Church which is determined that all laws shall be administered not merely in the interest of that Church but by it directly. King Jesus is the ruler of nations and the Church is the power appointed by him to execute his judgments. This is their postulate, more and more boldly avowed as the years pass and the prohibitory idea spreads and is accepted by larger and larger numbers of the people.

Yes, "Liberal" prohibitionists, it is through prohibition that the Church hopes and expects to gain complete control of the civil power. If you cannot be led to see the folly and crime of the principle of prohibition, in itself, perhaps you may see and heed the flaming danger signals to which only the totally blind can longer be oblivious, and so cease to give your support to a party whose success means a theocracy, pure and simple; means the utter overthrow of religious liberty.

Indications multiply on every hand that the prohibition party, The National Reform Association (God-in-the-Constitution party,) the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Sabbatarian associations are one in origin, spirit and purpose and soon will be one in united action. Let us look at some of these indications squarely and critically and see if my conclusion is not fully warranted by the facts.

To the recent convention of the New York prohibitionists, at Syracuse, went 918 delegates. A vote in the convention showed that ninety-five of these were ministers, while the church officers were "too many to count," and it was exultingly declared that all present were church members. The proceedings resembled church services and ended in putting a clergyman at the head of the ticket as the nominee for Secretary of State.

The New York *Voice* is the national organ of the Prohibition party. Its circulation is much greater than that of *all* the Liberal papers of all classes. It now numbers among its subscribers 6000 clergymen and is raising a fund to enable it to send a copy regularly until after November, 1888, to each of the 60,000 ministers, Catholic and Protestant, in the United States, whose names and addresses it has.

To accomplish this great undertaking $45,000 are needed, and subscriptions to the fund are pouring in in sums ranging in amount from fifty dollars to $2,500. Regarding this enterprise, the *Voice* says:

It is an intelligent and practicable attempt to bring the entire ministry to our side, and with them will come the church, and that means victory.

How well a few "Liberal" lecturers, editors and publishers would look sprinkled among those sixty thousand somber-garmented gentlemen, all working together for Prohibition and King Jesus!

Hear the *Voice* again:

No other movement has anything like the strategic importance as has a movement that would get the Church right on the Prohibition question. This would end the battle.

And it would also end Liberty.

The National Reform Association has just issued "An appeal to the leaders and members of the Prohibition party." Here is an excerpt therefrom:

We rejoice especially in the fact that the Temperance reformation has, in these days, become so distinctively a Christian movement, and we hail its approaching triumph as the enthronement, so far, of the law of Christ in our national life. We have watched with the greatest interest the rise and progress of the Prohibition party, and have listened with delight to the frequent and explicit acknowledgement in its platforms of the government of Almighty God and the supreme authority of His laws. In repeated instances in the platforms of county conventions, in at least three different States, express acknowledgement has been made of Jesus Christ as the King of nations—a fact peculiarly interesting and gratifying to Christian hearts.

In "An open letter to the leaders, officers and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union," the same Association says:

We who plead the cause of our National Christianity rely confidently on your help in the great struggle which is already upon us. We believe your hearts respond with cheerful loyalty to the view of Christ as the nation's King, presented in Document No. 1, which we send herewith. We also ask you to consider carefully the Document entitled "Is a Christian Party Forming?" which, together with an appeal to the Prohibition party, we also place in your hands.

Two things in particular your President [Miss Willard.—W.] has authorized us to ask of you in her name:

1. Will not all of you who speak or write improve your opportunities to inculcate upon the public mind the Christian principles of civil government" The great reforms for which you labor may well be—ought to be—demanded on the ground of the nation's relation to Christ and the supreme authority of His law. No other argument will so avail to arouse the conscience of a slumbering guilty nation or to sustain the friends of Temperance in the struggles and sacrifices which lie in the path to victory. "The government shall be on his shoulder;" "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;" "the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ;"—these great texts and others like them must, by ceaseless iteration, be driven home to the hearts and consciences of the people. Behind the Temperance question there looms up a long procession of the gravest questions,—concerning the maintenance of the Sabbath, the better protection of the Family, and the moral and religious tendencies of our public education—all of them living, urgent questions at this hour with the American people, and all of them vitally related to the protection of our homes. To settle the Temperance question on low and narrow grounds will leave all these still open questions. To settle it on right grounds will go far to settle rightly all the rest.

Mark it! "*Behind the Temperance question there looms up a long procession of the gravest questions*"—first and presumably chief of which is that "concerning the maintenance of the Sabbath." The prohibition and temperance questions are simply covers for what is beneath and behind, for the traitorous designs of the "Christian party" schemers. That this is the correct view is shown yet more clearly by the next to the last sentence above quoted: "To settle the Temperance question on low and narrow grounds will leave all these still open questions." In other words, to banish the liquor traffic because intemperance is an evil to the human race here and now would be to solve the temperance problem on "low and narrow grounds." Why? Because it would not make so wide a breach in the secular defenses as these priest-politicians desire. They want the prohibition hosts to sweep to victory over the high and broad grounds that Jesus is King of the nations and that prohibition finds its source and sanctions in the Bible. Of course they know the latter is not true, whatever they may believe about the Kingship of Jesus, but no little inaccuracy like that will be permitted for a moment to stand in the way of their ambition. Sunday *must* be fully under their control and if the Prohibition party triumphs as a Christian party it will be the easiest of tasks for them

to monopolize that day by the aid of severely repressive statutes. They *must* be supreme at the nuptual altar as at the bier, and Christian temperance, *i. e.*, the "Christian Party," in authority will give them back indissoluble marriage and make all women once again their unquestioning dupes and helpers. Education *must* be in their hands, the Bible must maintain its place in all the schools, along with prayers and other religious exercises, and all this is assured if upon the banners of victorious prohibition shall be inscribed, "JESUS CHRIST IS KING."

We must make no mistake. We cannot afford to be careless, indifferent, unheeding. From this hour on the man who gives voice or vote for the principle of prohibition or the candidates of any party standing upon a prohibition platform must be counted for what he is, an ally of the God-in-the-Constitution party, a supporter of the theocratic theory of government. In the day of final struggle the theocrats will unite with the plutocrats, the bigots with the exploiters of the fruits of toil, and in that time woe to the Freethinkers and to the Laborers if they shall be so blind then as they are now to the facts that there can be no compromise between Authority and Liberty, and that Prohibition is the most dangerous as it is the most fair-seeming and treacherous of the children born of the incestuous *liaison* of Queen Church and King Government. W.

SHORT-SIGHTED REVENGE.

Of all purblind guides of the people none were ever duller of sight than are the conductors of the popular papers of today. These gentry glory in the now seemingly inevitable cold-blooded murder of the Seven of Chicago. They imagine that when these men are dead a great danger to the institutions of this country will have been happily averted. Foolish babblers! Know they nothing of the experience of the race? Are they utterly oblivious to every lesson of history? Does the blood lust draw before their eyes a *mirage* of delusive optimism in which all things are seen in an inverted position? Are they so mad with hate and revenge and fear that they know not that the worst of all possible things that can happen to the system they cherish and so unscrupulously defend will be the legal death of Spies, Fielden, Parsons and their comrades? These men are no common murderers (they are not murderers at all) and it makes little difference, so far as the results that will flow from their execution are concerned, whether their's is or is not the true philosophy of social organization. You give their principles a new lease of life by attracting for them widespread examination and acceptance when you judicially strangle to death the men who teach them. These men you are so eager to slaughter represent ideas and you cannot kill ideas by butchering the men who hold and circulate them. Whether the ideas of the doomed Socialists are true or false, we are not at this moment inquiring. Whether true or false, upon the morrow of these men's murder the ideas will be a thousand times more dangerous to existing institutions than they have ever been before. Leaving aside all questions of the guilt or innocence of the convicted men and of the soundness or unsoundness of their teachings, the wisest possible thing the government can do is to spare their lives. No State can deliberately kill in more wantonness of power the leaders of a portion of the people and be as strong afterward as before. Mercy is a sure sign of strength; vindictive killing, the infallible indication of weakness. The victorious North was a thousand-fold stronger the day it gave Jefferson Davis his life than this nation will be the 11th day of next November if the sentence of death is executed upon the condemned Socialists. This is the teaching of all the Past, the experience of Humanity under every ting and upon every shore. The blood of legally killed agitators is the most terribly fruitful of all seeds. Its scarlet drops are the dragon's teeth sown by the reckless hand of a madly foolish government and from them surely spring woes and wars, all the fiends and furies of Revolution. Will those who hold power and those who manufacture public opinion never learn even one little lesson from the open pages of history? Will they ever persist in stumbling on over the bodies of their victims, on into the night and storm and death which are the natural sequences of power abused, of rank injustice done, of merciless vengeance executed?

That these men of Chicago are guilty of the police killing with which they are charged no impartial man who has read the testimony carefully, believes. There was no conspiracy. The Haymarket meeting was similar to hundreds that had preceded it. When the police charged down upon it it had dwindled from thousands to a very few hundreds; the speaking was almost over and in a few minutes the people yet remaining would have quietly dispersed.

It is admitted that these men were not the principals, but with the cool malignity of revenge it is proposed to murder them as accessories. But how can you rightfully punish a man as accessory when you do not know who the principal was? Or his motives and object? There is not the smallest particle of evidence to show that these men who are to die for their opinions had any connection, directly or indirectly, with the person who threw the bomb.

But suppose there were such evidence, what then? To peacefully assemble is one of the rights of American citizens; the right to keep and bear arms is guaranteed by the Constitution. If the police attack or merely order a peaceful assemblage to disperse they are the aggressors. The people are clearly within their right if they refuse to disperse. And the police are as clearly exceeding their authority if they attempt to enforce their unlawful order. The aggressors are responsible for all bad consequences.

In so far as Spies and his co-workers are Anarchistic in their philosophy I am in hearty accord with them; in so far as they are State Socialistic, *i. e.*, in favor of an extension of the powers of the State, I am as heartily opposed to them; I regard them as much more nearly State Socialistic than Anarchistic. But all this has nothing to do with the question now before us. They had the natural and constitutional right to address a meeting of their fellow citizens; that was a peaceful meeting when attacked by the police, and for the bloodshed which ensued they were in no way responsible, for the two all-sufficient reasons that they did not provoke it and that there was no connection between them and the actual thrower of the bomb which killed the policemen.

I conclude as I began,—no matter what are the opinions of these men, the only just and wise thing the State can do is to revoke its edict of death. The memory of a martyr is a perpetual menace to the power that made him a martyr, and if these men are choked to death by the State of Illinois they will be martyrs. Hundreds of thousands of men and women think so this year; in the years to come millions will so think.

O, State, beware! Injustice is ever its own nemesis. W.

"THE LAND TAX."

The Enterprise *Anti-Monopolist* states as one of the current objections to the land theory of Henry George that "it would relieve industry of all taxes." The *Anti-Monopolist* accepts the George theory and it thinks it absurd that any such objections should be made to it. So do I, and I wonder who could possibly think levying all taxes on land would relieve industry of taxes.

In the first place, the farmer is himself a laborer and were it possible by the land tax to compel him to pay all taxes, would not industry still be bearing the burdens? But be sure that if you *do* put all taxes upon the land holder the wage worker will continue to help pay them. Any man who consumes the products of the farm must help pay this increased cost of production, which tax to the farmer will take the place of that which he formerly paid directly to the State or to his employer or to the merchant. So long as you support government by taxation labor will pay that tax. Every dollar raised for the government must be paid by the workers. The George men have been called the "burden-shifters," but the designation is hardly accurate, for the burden of taxation is not *permanently* shifted; all classes of laborers will assist in bearing it then as now, should that party prevail. I honestly think that no other so delusive "reform" has been advocated by so many advanced (in sentiment) humanitarians in three generations. W.

Flashes.

Samuel Bennett, writing in the New York *Leader*, in defining what he calls "True Individualism," says: "Every law curtails the individualism of some." That is true; therefore there should be no laws other than those which are needed to restrain the person who invades and in so doing curtails the individualism of another or of others. Individualism is the first condition of progress and no law can rightfully curtail the individualism of any man unless he has first done something that limits or destroys the individualism of an uninvading neighbor. This is the gist of the whole question and shows where the dividing line between Authority and Liberty is to be drawn.

† †

Friend Pilcher says: "Our present system of private property contains the elements of its own destruction." We have no system of private property. No man's—especially no poor man's—private property is secure from the filching fingers of government and government-privileged persons and corporations. The trouble is, not that we have too great but that we have altogether too little regard for private property rights.

† †

I am very glad to learn that Mr. Barner has been released from jail. His statement that he was merely giving shelter and food to a friendless woman should have been accepted without question. If she had no complaint to make certainly no one else had, and no one had any right to break into his domicile and put him to annoyance and expense. There is altogether too much of this petty meddling and thieving going on in those days.

† †

There is a movement on foot in Canada to stop the running of all Sunday trains in that country. The plan is one designed by the Ministerial Association of St. Thomas. These parsons think that they can secure so many signatures to a petition praying for such a law that the Dominion Parliament will not dare refuse to pass it. One petition is to be signed by voters; another by all other adults. It is expected that a majority of the men and women of Canada will sign these petitions. The law is to be something like this:

The Parliament will pass an act making it the duty of the "Governor-General to issue a proclamation prohibiting Sunday railway traffic throughout the entire Dominion at such date as a similar act shall come into operation in the United States."

So it will be seen that our Congress is to go into the Sunday legislating business at once or grievously disappoint the Canadian saints.

The writer—A. H. Munro in the *Christian Statesman*—who gives these details, sadly admits that Congress has not as yet passed such an act nor has any movement been made to induce it to do so, but he cheers up when he recalls the fact that there are "in the United States 20,000,000 of Church-members and 40,000,000 of Church-goers."

For one, I think that his confidence is not misplaced, and I believe that the time is nearer even than he hopes when Sunday will once more be entirely in the hands of the priesthood. The railway magnates will yield this, *to them*, comparatively unimportant point for the sake of the friendship and much needed help of the church in their struggle with the Socialists, Anarchists and other labor reformers. These kings of the rail will give ready enough homage to "King Jesus" if only his representatives will say little or nothing of the wrongs of the people they exploit.

† †

On the Protestant principle of marriage the free lovers are logical; and that Protestants generally are not free-lovers is to be attributed to their personal virtues, not to the system of which they nominally are adherents.—Catholic Standard.

This is a left-handed compliment to Protestants (including conservative Liberals), flattering their moral sentiments at the expense of their reason. But the *Standard* is at least partly right; the Catholic idea is that marriage is a sacrament and indissoluble; the Protestant, that it is a natural relation, depending only upon the parties thereto. If Protestants were logical they—would not be Protestants! On the marriage question they must stand with the Catholics or with the Free Lovers. If, as Protestantism says, marriage is a natural relation merely, requiring for its inception the consent of the parties only, then the consent of said parties is all that is necessary for its dissolution.

† †

The Leavenworth *Times* and other patent morality papers are calling loudly for a search and seizure clause in the present prohibitory law. No doubt any number of corkscrew-nosed sneaks could be found who would gladly undertake—for pay—to personally inspect the domiciles of all "suspects." And while we are about it suppose we create the office of State Smeller of Pickles and Mincepies and make D. R. Anthony the first incumbent of the position. Whiskey and other prohibition beverages often lurk maliciously in these articles of diet. Any housewife or cook who shall refuse to admit the Inspector to her kitchen, to be instantly put to death.

† †

Every man in Kansas is practically a protectionist irrespective of what he may preach. When a town or a community gives aid to secure railroads or any enterprise, it is giving protection to stimulate enterprise at a period when the business will not warrant the investment without the aid given.—Leavenworth Times.

To lay a compulsory tax by a majority vote in aid of a railroad or any other improvement *is* of the same nature as a protective tariff and is equally unconstitutional and unjust. Every individual is free to give just as much as he thinks he can afford in aid of any enterprise but he has not a particle of right to compel any one else to give a cent. This is the solid bed-rock principle of natural equity and neighborly courtesy.

† †

Our fathers left a blank in the charter of our government. We are asked to-day to fill that blank with ATHEISM. For answer we propose to write the NAME which is above every name.—National Reform Association.

No, the fathers did not leave such a blank in the Constitution. Where your creed-covered eyes see nothing they wrote RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. They did not say "There is no god," nor "We see no evidence in support of a belief in a god." They knew that a united Church and State had always been a curse to the race and they meant that this should be a government under which all free persons, irrespective of belief, should receive full protection in their civic rights. Alas! they did not foresee that their degenerate descendants would trample all the safeguards of religious freedom beneath their feet and seek to make the Constitution itself give sanction to their high crimes against human rights. Civil compacts have rightfully nothing to do with Christ or Anti-Christ. They must be non-partisan in all matters of belief. But these ultra theocrats are not satisfied with an impartial constitution and equitable laws. They must have all or nothing. It seems that they will have all soon.

† †

We believe in personal rights, not personal liberty.—N. Y. Voice.

If you do not believe in personal liberty you do not believe in personal rights, for the first and greatest of all personal rights is the right to personal liberty, and without personal liberty no person can for a moment be secure in the possession of personal rights of any kind. Personal rights without personal liberty are non-existent

† †

What has become of *Honesty*, our Melbourne Anarchistic co-laborer? We have not seen a copy since the 2d.... If certain of our so-called Liberal papers would stop gushing about Jesus and cursing men of brains like S. P. Andrews and the philosophical Egoists they would be serving the cause much more efficiently....That brilliant State Socialist, Burnette G. Haskell, has resigned his position as managing editor of the Denver *Labor Enquirer*.....Lois Waisbrooker has resurrected her *Foundation Principles* at Antioch, California. It is bright, breezy and fearless as ever.....Editor Lamb of the Kirwin *Independent* calls the killing off of landlords the "Anarchistic" method. If there is anything that Editor Lamb knows less about than he does about the effect the Henry George land system would have, it is Anarchy. Anarchism means passive resistance, not war, Mr. Lamb....Send to us for books when in need of good works....I am glad to see the *Journal of Hygieo-Therapy* (Kokomo, Ind.) take such an intelligent stand against vaccination....God burned down the Lutheran church a few weeks ago, but the parish has disregarded the warning and is rapidly pushing another to completion on the same site. God is said to be "manifest in his works," and it would seem that his faithful followers should have more respect for him than is shown in this act. W.

The Valley Falls Debate.

Moses Hull's Seventh Speech in Reply to Eld. Clark Braden.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Braden's twenty-third proposition, or the twenty-third way he has of stating the case, is as follows:

"Christianity gives to us a perfect expiation and atonement in the son of God. It exhibits God's abhorrence of sin and it appeals to the human heart as nothing else can, or has. There is a power over the human heart in the cross of Christ and his sufferings for his enemies that nothing else ever had."

Probably no institution in the world has ever done so large a business on so small a capital as the church, and possibly very few even of the ministry are capable of kindling so big a fire with so little material as Mr. Braden. He continues to hand out his propositions and probably will, to the end of this debate without an *iota* of proof, or without feeling that anything more than his bald assertion, put out in the form of a proposition, could be needed. The idea of mixing in any proof of his assertions has never yet occurred to him. What does he mean by expiation and atonement? What proof does he present of the perfect atonement? What proof has he that the person whom he calls "The son of God," is any more God's son than any other Jew or Gentile might be? He has not nor can he present one particle of proof of the existence of such an individual. Where does the gospel exhibit God's abhorrence for sin? Was it in his killing his own son? I cannot imagine how a God can do a more sinful act than that! Is that the way he shows his abhorrence for sin? Would I show my abhorrence for sin by killing my own child? When and where did Christ suffer for the sins of his enemies? He was put to death by the authorities for the violation or for supposed violation of the law, just as hundreds of thousands of guilty and innocent persons have been both before and since that tragedy. In what sense was it the "sins of his enemies" that caused him to suffer, any more than the sins of the enemies of John Brown caused him to suffer? What power is there in the cross of Christ," "over the human heart" more than there has been in any other superstition? Mr. Braden is a scholar and knows something of the power of superstition. Many thousand individuals, even little children, found power enough in a supposed empty tomb to cause them to march in platoons into the jaws of death. Read the history of the Crusades, and a hundred other equally as fanatical religious movements and you will find you need something more for proof of a case than the power in some talismanic word by which a superstitious and unthinking people have been moved.

Now that I have considered the baseless assertions of this proposition let me spend a moment or two in considering its doctrines. Christianity furnishes us a perfect expiation and atonement. Does it? If it does not then my friend is making false claims for his system, and if it does, so much the worse for the system. Any system that allows the sinner to escape the consequences of his acts must be demoralizing in its tendency; it teaches him to act without reference to consequences. If Jesus has made a way by which hell-deserving sinners can escape justice and get a heaven they do not deserve, he has contributed just that much to the cause of injustice, and offers the atonement or expiation as a premium on sin.

Indeed the atonement theory makes sin necessary as a part of God's economy; no wonder Paul thanked God in Rom. vi 17 that the Romans had been sinners, "For where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Sin is that which proves God's love and grace; it never could have been demonstrated by any other means; thus the Gospel, instead of "exhibiting God's abhorrence of sin," exhibits exactly the opposite. "There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." If one in a hundred were not sinners, heaven would have little joy. A waggish poet after reading Luke xv: 7-10 said:

"Then why not sin those hosts to please,
Repenting at our leisure,
Enjoy ourselves and take our ease,
To give those angels pleasure.

"For ninety-nine upright and just,
Can't please these heavenly hosts
As much as one 'ungodly cuss'—
Blaspheming Holy Ghosts.

"And when he is old and can partake
No more of sinful pleasures,
What joy those heavenly hosts will take
At his repenting measures.

"Then let us sin, dear girls and boys,
Repent and be forgiven;
The more we taste these sinful joys,
The greater joy in heaven."

Mr. Braden speaks of the unequalled power of the cross of Christ. I admit that in the name of the cross Constantine deluged the civilized world in blood,—that the Catholic church by the power of the cross assassinated one hundred millions of better people than they were; and that Protestantism since its rise has developed and used much power in the name of the cross of Christ, but the power has nearly always been that of the warrior. When science and the cross have been brought to bear upon each other, and the cross has not been backed by fire, sword and cannon the battle has resulted as Huxley stated in his Lay Sermons, p 278.

"Extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science, as the strangled snakes beside that of Hercules; and history records that, whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated; scotched if not slain. But orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget."

Mr. Braden talks of the power of the cross, but, in the language of the late John W. Draper, L. L. D., M. D., one of the professors of the New York University, I prophesy that,

"The time approaches when men must take their choice between quiescent faith and ever advancing science—faith with its mediæval consolations, science, which is ever scattering its material blessings in the pathway of life, elevating the lot of man in this world, and unifying the human race. Its triumphs are solid and enduring. But the glory which Catholicism [and Protestantism] might gain from a conflict with material ideas, is at best, only like that of other celestial meteors, when they touch the atmosphere of the earth—transitory and useless."

Continued on fourth page.

PRACTICAL CO-OPERATION.
By E. C. WALKER.
Some hints as to the methods of Self-help and Voluntary Mutualism. Price, 10 cts.

NEVER MIND WHAT "THEY" SAY.

Don't worry nor fret
About what people think
Of your ways or your means—
Of your food or your drink,
If you know you are doing
Your best every day,
With the right on your side,
Never mind what "they" say.

Lay out in the morning
Your plans for each hour,
And never forget
That Old Time is a power.
This also remember,
'Mong truths old and new,—
The world is too busy
To think much of you.

Then garner the minutes
That make up the hours,
And pluck in your pilgrimage
Honor's bright flowers.
Should grumblers assure you
Your course will not pay,
With conscience at rest,
Never mind what "they" say.

Then let us, forgetting
The insensate throng
That jostles us daily
While marching along,
Press onward and upward,
And make no delay;
And though people talk
Never mind what "they" say.

Every wanton and *causeless* restraint of the will of the subject, whether practiced by a monarch, a nobility, or a popular assembly, is a degree of tyranny.—*Blackstone.*

The liberty of the press is the true measure of liberty of the people. The one cannot be attacked without injury to the other. Our thoughts ought to be perfectly free; to bridle them, or stifle them, in this sanctuary, is the crime of unwise humanity. What can I call my own, if my thoughts are not mine?—*Mercier.*

Discussion.

W. S. Bell is to hold a joint discussion with Elder Williamson at Salem, Nebraska, beginning November 1st, and continuing four nights. The questions for debate are:

Resolved, That Christ is a historic character, the *logos* of God, and hence the savior of the world. Elder Williamson affirms.

2. *Resolved*, That the Bible is of human origin, and hence not a revelation from God. W. S. Bell affirms.

Tax Dodging.

Nothing is falser than the claim that property pays all except the poll taxes. Taxation, substantially all of it, falls upon persons, not property. No man who eats, drinks, wears clothing or lives in a house fails to pay his share. Whether he pays directly to the tax collector is immaterial; if he does not do so he pays just as certainly. Taxes are added by the landlord to the rent; they are added to the cost of every article of clothing and food, so that the rent that is paid, and anything bought, contains taxes as part of its price. Generally, indeed, more is thus paid indirectly than the first amount levied by the authorities; the manufacturer adds his tax to his product before he sells to the wholesale dealer, who adds his tax to the price for which he sells to the retailer, and the latter, in his turn, adds his tax to the price at which he sells to the consumer. Thus the consumer may pay the tax three times over. Generally, too, each puts into the price he sells at not only his tax, but an increase upon it.—JOSIAH G. ABBOTT, in *Boston Globe*.

Not Through the State.

How then is science to be advanced, you may inquire, if the majority cannot decide that which is true, and the select few also cannot decide? In the way in which up to the present it has been advanced,—by individuals contributing their small shares; and with ever increasing force will it advance; as the general culture becomes greater and broader. It will advance by having no opinion protected from discussion and agitation, by having the greatest possible freedom of thought, of speech, and of the press. That the unaided efforts of a people are capable of causing advance belongs fortunately no longer to the domain of opinion, but of fact. They have already caused all the progress that has been made, not only without the aid of the State, but in opposition to the State and the Church, and all the other conservative and retrogressive forces in society. They have already, as Spencer says, evolved a language greater in complexity and beauty than could be conceived in any other way. They have, as Whately says, succeeded in supplying large cities with food with scarcely any apparent waste or friction, while no government in the world, with all the machinery at its command, has ever yet succeeded in properly supplying an army.

Yes, freedom, hampered as it has been, has done and is doing all these things, and all that it is capable of doing in the future can best be [illegible]

[illegible]

We know your heart is right,
We know the light that saves,
We bring the morning star!
Freedom's good things we bring you, where so all good things are.

GERTRUDE B. KELLY, in *Liberty*.

Ingersoll's Tribute to Henry Ward Beecher. Price, 5c. Send for it.

The Valley Falls Debate.

Continued from third page.

Moses Hull's Fourth Speech in Reply to Eld. Clark Braden.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In my last I thoroughly reviewed Mr. Braden's *twenty-third* proposition, which was mostly contained in his *twenty-second* proposition; now comes proposition *twenty-four*, all of which was in the last two propositions so I will pass it for the next which reads as follows:

"Christianity presents to us Jesus, 'the captain of our salvation,' as a leader in religion and in life and reformation of the individual and the race. It thus meets a want of the human heart. All revolutions and great movements have had and must have a leader."

It sounds well to talk of Jesus as a "leader," yet nobody takes him as such. Mr. Braden himself does nothing that Jesus commanded, or nothing that Jesus did except to eat, drink and sleep. Does Mr. Braden go two miles with the one who asks him to go one? Does he give his cloak to one who would take his coat? Does he lend expecting not to receive back from the one to whom he lends? Will Bro. B. sell all he has and give to the poor? Does he take no thought for the morrow, what he shall eat or drink or wherewithal he shall be clothed? Does he want his congregation to obey the sermon on the mount? Were they to undertake it you would hear Eld. Braden say: "Where in the d——ickens is my salary to come from?"

Does Mr. Braden follow his "leader?" Will he go into the banking houses of Chicago or Kansas City and "overthrow the tables of the money changers," and make "a scourge of small cords" and drive them out as his "captain" did? Will he send two of his friends to get a stranger's colt and get on it and ride into Atchison as Jesus rode into Jerusalem? Come, Bro. B., follow your "captain"—your "leader." The fact is, apologizing Jesus is one thing and believing his word and obeying him is quite another. Bro. Braden does not believe in Jesus and could not be induced to obey his commands or believe his promises. Jesus said believers shall handle snakes, and "drink deadly poison," and it should not hurt them. Will he try a dose of oxalic acid? If he does and it does not hurt him, it will not only prove his faith but it will make more converts to his "leader," than all the debates he has ever held. Propositions, though Mr. Braden could find still *thirty-four* more ways of stating them, would not make one convert to where he could make a thousand if he would only be consistent enough to show his faith by his works. With faith only as large as "a grain of mustard seed," Bro. Braden himself could be a leader in the Christian revolution," before whom all other "leaders," the "captain" not excepted, would pale into insignificance.

Proposition *twenty-six* has only one point in it worthy of notice, and that is "the perfect example," in the life of Jesus. Where there was a good example, I have shown you that Mr. Braden and his co-Christians do not follow it. But Jesus' "example," if he ever set one, was not perfect; on the contrary it was very imperfect.

His turning water into wine for people who were already drunk, would be regarded as a very bad "example" by the prohibition people of this state and of Iowa. His anger in cursing somebody's fig-tree for not producing figs out of season is an example I hope Bro. Braden will not follow if he ever visits my few apple and cherry trees. His overthrow of the tables is an example for the following of which Anarchists are under the sentence of death.

Jesus set a bad example when he looked around upon his audience in anger because they could not answer a question. See Mark iii: 5.

Was his "example" in refusing to see his mother and brothers a good one? I think not. Come, Bro. B., give us one proposition that you believe and will be willing to stand by.

Mr. Braden's proposition numbered *twenty-seven* either has no meaning or is false. I will give it entire and discuss it *seriatim:*

"Christianity presents a perfect object of faith, gratitude, devotion and love in Jesus of Nazareth. This is the means of the regeneration and salvation of men. It is by faith in, love and gratitude for, and devotion to an embodiment of life and truth, and a leader in reformation that men are saved and reformed. It has been so in individual life and in revolution and reformation."

This proposition when stripped of superfluous and meaningless words, means about this:

1. Jesus is an object of faith, gratitude and devotion.

2. Devotion to Jesus is the means of regeneration and salvation.

3. Men are saved by faith in, and love for some person as a leader.

Now on the first part of this proposition I ask, why is Jesus an object of faith and for what should we be grateful to him? Why be devoted to him instead of to humanity? [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[